



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,802	12/02/2003	Osamu Kobayashi	GENSP014	4125
22434	7590	03/28/2006	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			LEE, CHUN KUAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	
DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/726,802

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI, OSAMU

Examiner

Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee

Art Unit

2181

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED 06 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
Please see Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Supervisory*  
*Fritz Fleming*  
FRITZ FLEMING  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2100  
442181  
3/24/2006

In respond to applicant's argument that "Kim is strictly limited to digital video display even those capable of receiving analog signal" and "at no point does Kim teach or even remotely suggest analog video display (in all discussions, an incoming analog video signal is ALWAYS converted to a digital video signal for display)," therefore, "Kim reference cannot be combined with the '437 reference since the '437 reference teaches that the display device can be either a digital or an analog display device without restriction, stated on page 8, lines 1-22. The argument has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive.

Examiner admit that Kim teaches the outputting of only digital signal, therefore can only be displayed on a digital display device, but it appears that the applicant is treating the rejection for claims 1, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Clark ('437 reference) clearly teaches that preference of the type of monitor (digital or analog) may be desired for utilization depending on certain environment, more specifically, for applications such as CAD, video editing and financial applications, an analog display (CRT) is preferred (Clark, col. 2, ll. 1-35) and the motivation for combining Clark with Kim is the reduction in manufacturing cost as hardware requirement reduces while implementing a multi-display system (Clark, col. 2, ll. 15-20 and Abstract), having the both options of utilizing digital display and analog display depending on the environment.

In respond to applicant's argument that the DVI signal cable does not support analog display, on page 8, lines 21-22. The argument has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. Kim teaches that the DVI standard utilizing the DVI signal cable comprise of DVI-D signal cable and DVI-I signal cable, wherein DVI-I signal cable do support analog display (Kim, col. 1, l. 18 to col. 2, l. 6), therefore Kim's teaching of the DVI-I signal cable can support Clark's analog display (CRT).

In respond to applicant's argument that Kim does not teach the configuration of a coupling device itself base upon the (analog or digital) nature of the source, therefore the coupling device is not configured, on page 8, line 23 to page 9, line 12. The argument has been fully considered but is not found to be persuasive. Kim teaches a coupling device (Kim, Fig. 1, ref 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8), wherein said coupling device detects whether the inputting signal is a digital signal or an analog video signal, then said coupling device is configured to properly display a signal on the screen base on the detection (Kim, col. 4, ll. 6-43).

Similar arguments as stated above are also applied to independent claims 8 and 15. All remaining dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are unpatentable at least because they include all the limitations recited in the independent claims 1, 8 and 15.